

Appln No. 10/750,098

Amdt date January 31, 2005

Reply to Office action of October 29, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office action dated October 29, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 16, 23, 24, 29, 31 - 35 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and raised an objection to claim 19. Claims 17 - 22, 30, 36 and 37 were deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 30, 36 and 37. In addition Applicant has canceled claim 17 and added claims 39 - 41. Finally, Applicant has formally canceled previously withdrawn claims 1 - 15 and 25 - 28. Reconsideration and reexamination are hereby requested for claims 16 - 24 and 29 - 41 that are now pending in this application.

Response to the Objection to Claim 19

Applicant has amended claim 19 in a manner comparable to that suggested by the Examiner.

Amendment of Allowable Claims

Applicant has amended claim 30 to independent form including the limitations of original independent claim 16. Applicant has amended claim 36 to independent form including the limitations of original independent claim 23. Claim 37 has been amended to depend on claim 36. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 30, 36 and 37 are allowable.

Appln No. 10/750,098

Amdt date January 31, 2005

Reply to Office action of October 29, 2004

Response to the Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 16, 23, 24, 29, 31 - 35 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Traylor, U.S. Patent No. 5,473,756. Claims 16 and 23 are independent claims.

Applicant has amended claim 16 to include the limitations of claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 16 is allowable.

Claims 18 - 22, 29 and 39 that depend on claim 16 also are patentable over Traylor for the reason set forth above. In addition, these dependent claims are patentable over Traylor for the additional limitations that these claims contain.

Applicant has amended claim 23 to recite, in part: "propagating a read flag signal through a read shift register, comprising a first set of registers, in response to a read clock" and "propagating a write flag signal through a write shift register, comprising a second set of registers wherein the second set of registers is smaller in number than the first set of registers, in response to the write clock." Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 23 is allowable.

Claims 24, 31 - 35, 38 and 40 - 41 that depend on claim 23 also are patentable over Traylor for the reason set forth above. In addition, these dependent claims are patentable over Traylor for the additional limitations that these claims contain.

Appln No. 10/750,098

Amdt date January 31, 2005

Reply to Office action of October 29, 2004

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited references and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By


Stephen D. Burbach

Reg. No. 40,285

626/795-9900

SDB/cah

CAH PAS605236.2-* 01/31/05 12:58 PM